

### **REMARKS**

Claims 4, 5, 16, 17, 25 and 26 have been canceled; therefore, claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-24 and 27-29 are pending. Claims 1, 12 and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-3, 6-15, 18-24 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,732,159 to Levine (hereinafter "Levine"). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's position for the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP §2131 that "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...." With regard to independent claims 1, 12 and 21, Applicant submits that Levine clearly fails to teach every element thereof.

In particular, claim 1, as amended recites in part:

a computer system including a basic input output system (BIOS) configured to provide a translation from display information to a data pattern output via a serial port in the system for generating an audible output, wherein in response to detecting the speech synthesizer, the BIOS translates the information to a data pattern, which data pattern is provided to the speech synthesizer;

As required by claim 1, the BIOS of Applicant's invention performs translation of display information to a data pattern, which data pattern is provided to a speech synthesizer. In contrast, Levine teaches, at column 5, lines 27-46, and column 6, lines 1-4, that the display information, such as data issued from the BIOS 3 and normally directed to a display adapter and local video display, is provided directly (i.e., in non-translated form) to an administration adapter 10. In direct contrast to Applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1, no translation of the data is performed by the BIOS prior to its being provided to the administration adapter.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that Levine fails to teach every element of independent claim 1. Therefore, it is apparent that the rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2, 3 and 6-11 dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is not supported by Levine and should therefore be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 12-15, 18-24 and 27-29 include limitations similar to those of claims 1-3 and 6-11; therefore, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with reference to claim 1, the

rejection of claims 12-15, 18-24 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn and those claims allowed.

### Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in detail above, independent claims 1, 12 and 21 are deemed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, 6-11, 13-15, 18-20, 22-24 and 27-29 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 12 and 21, and are therefore also deemed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the pending rejections and issue a formal notice of allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Bell

Registration No. 26,528

Dated: 11-30-06  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789  
Telephone: 512/867-8407  
Facsimile: 214/200-0853  
ipdocketing@haynesboone.com


#### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, via EFS-Web, on the date indicated below:

on

Date

November 30, 2006



Susan C. Lien